

REMARKS

This amendment responds to the office action dated July 28, 2008.

As previously presented, claim 1 lacked an antecedent for the first instance of the recitation of "said at least one pixel." Claim 1 has been amended to correct this error.

The Examiner indicated that claim 3 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. The applicant has added new independent claim 4, which as amended, incorporates all the limitations of previously presented claims 1 and 3. Claim 4 should therefore be allowable.

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Sekiya et al., U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0006949 (hereinafter Sekiya) and Overdick et al., U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0024017 (hereinafter Overdick). The Examiner's rejection is improper, as neither cited reference discloses the limitation of "overdriving [a] pixel . . . to a current value . . . selected based upon: (i) at least one predicted displayed luminance value of said pixel in respective ones of at least one subsequent frame of said image." The Examiner concedes that Sekiya fails to disclose this limitation, but argues that "Overdick et al. further teaches at least one predicted displayed luminance value of said pixel in respective ones of at least one frame of said image." The applicant respectfully suggests that the Examiner's argument is flawed.

The limitation at issue, and absent from the primary reference, is "overdriving [a] pixel . . . to a current value . . . selected based upon" the predicted displayed luminance of that pixel in a subsequent frame. Even assuming that Overdick in fact discloses predicting the displayed luminance of a pixel at a time subsequent to a first frame, the reference does not teach the step of *overdriving* the pixel to a value for the current frame *based upon* that predicted luminance. The

applicant notes that Overdick does not disclose overdriving pixels at all. Overdick discloses a method of editing, post hoc, X-ray images so as to correct for residual images left from prior X-rays. Specifically, and X-ray apparatus includes an X-Ray generator aimed at an array of photodiodes uniformly illuminated from behind by a light source. In front of the scintillator that converts X-Rays to visible light. The combination of the transformed light from the scintillator and the backlight is converted to a series of electrical signals by the array of photodiodes. Overdick notes that both the scintillator and the photodiodes retain a residual image from previous X-rays. To correct for these errors, the array of photodiodes is illuminated only by the light source both before and after an X-ray is taken. The earlier image may be a stored referenced image, but the later image is recorded immediately after the X-ray is taken so that the photodiodes are illuminated by the residual image from the scintillator.

At no point in this procedure does Overdick teach *selecting* the luminance of any pixel in the array of photodiodes, or driving the pixel to any desired or calculated value. Overdick only reads the luminance values so as to correct for residual images left from prior X-rays. Thus, not only does Overdick not teach the claim limitation at issue, but appears to have no relevance to the primary reference, Sekiya, which *drives* pixels in an array to desired luminance values, based upon image information from frames of a video sequence to be displayed.

Moreover, as evidenced by the preceding discussion of Overdick, that reference does not teach *predicting* (or anticipating) the displayed luminance of a pixel in a subsequent image, it teaches *measuring* the luminance at a pixel of an array by *taking* a subsequent image from the array. This subsequent reading involves uniformly flashing the array with a backlight, but this is not a *predicted* luminance of a pixel, as the luminance of the pixel will be the combination of the

backlight intensity, the stored gain in the respective photodiodes, and the residual afterglow from the scintillator.

Finally, to further distinguish over Overdick, the applicant has amended claim 1 to clarify that the current and subsequent frames are from a video to be displayed. The subsequent image (or frame) of Overdick is not a video.

For each of the preceding reasons, independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited combination of Sekiya and Overdick. Dependent claims 2 and 3 depend from independent claim 1 and are therefore also distinguished over the cited prior art. The applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner's rejection of claims 1 and 2 be withdrawn, and the Examiner's objection to claim 3 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-4.

Respectfully submitted,



Kurt Rohlf
Reg. No. 54,405
Tel No.: (503) 227-5631